

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over previously cited Kao (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0033726) in view of well known prior art. Applicant again respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position and traverses the prior art rejections.

Claim 1 recites in part:

a card type plug having a plug body and a plurality of pins on a top of the plug body;

a card type receptacle having a receptacle body receiving the card type plug therein.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Kao of a card type plug and a card type receptacle, as required by the claims. During a personal interview conducted on June 12, 2008, Applicant's representative discussed at great length with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor, the differences between the claimed invention and Kao. In particular, Applicant's representative submitted that Kao generally relates to a connection plug for allowing a user to connect a connector of a compact flash (CF) card or a memory card to a USB Series A or Series B receptacle, or to connect a USB plug to a plug or receptacle of the USB series A, series Mini-A, series Mini-B, and series Mini-AB (see for example paragraph [0010] of Kao). However, Kao does not teach or suggest a card type plug or

a card type receptacle, as claimed. During the interview, the Examiner acknowledged that Kao indeed does not teach a card type receptacle receiving a card type plug.

However, the Examiner now asserts:

While in light of the arguments as well as the interview held on 12 June 2008, the examiner understands that the invention sought to be claimed is plug and a receptacle combined into one separable unit, the breadth of the current claim language does not clearly require that interpretation. The teachings of Kao in view of what is old and well known in the art teach the limitations of a plug and a receptacle combining as a connector, with the plug being inserted into the receptacle. The claims as written do not require that the plug component and receptacle component are connected via an interface other than the plug and receptacle. Therefore, the previously applied rejections under 35 USC 103 are maintained.²

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position and submits that the Examiner's position continues to be erroneous due to a misreading or misinterpretation of the claim. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the claims do not merely disclose a "plug and a receptacle combined into one separable unit". The claims disclose a card type USB connector comprising a card type plug and a card type receptacle having a receptacle body for receiving the card type plug. The card type USB connector may then be connected to USB series A and B plugs or receptacles. This clearly differs from Kao which provides a plug which is used to connect a USB receptacle or a USB plug.

The Examiner asserts that "the claims as written do not require that the plug component and receptacle component are connected via an interface other than the plug and

² Page 2 of the Office Action dated June 23, 2008.

receptacle". Applicant finds the Examiner's position unclear. Independent claim 1 and analogous independent claim 4 disclose a card type receptacle which receives a card type plug, wherein the card type receptacle and the card type plug are electrically connected via a plurality of pins inside the receptacle body and a plurality of pins on a top of the card type plug body. These features are not taught nor suggested by Kao.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 4, and 7 should be allowable because the cited reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1, 4, and 7.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Wallerson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Mark E. Wallerson
Registration No. 59,043

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 23, 2008